Application No. 10/051,179
Response dated October 30, 2003
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2003
Docket No. 2505-1002

REMARKS

This Official Action is a restriction requirement.

Applicant has carefully studied the bases for this restriction requirement and believes that they are not viable. Accordingly, applicant traverses that requirement.

However, in accordance with the Official Action, applicant provisionally elects Group I of the claims, i.e., claims 1-9, drawn to a runway.

The Official Action states that Groups I and II are related as combination and subcombination. The Official Action further states that such groups are considered distinct inventions if it can be shown that the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and further that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations. Reference is made to MPEP §806.05(c).

In this case, the Official Action indicates that the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations. The Official Action indicates that the subcombination has separate utility such as a connector for panels or strips.

The Official Action makes the same basic argument as to Groups I and III. In this instance, the Official Action states

Application No. 10/051,179
Response dated October 30, 2003
Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2003
Docket No. 2505-1002

that the subcombination has utility as a connector for assembling and disassembling parts of a toy, such as a block.

Applicant traverses this requirement for restriction because the features claimed in Groups II and III have been specifically developed in view of the use of the elements as component parts of the structure according to the claims of Group I.

As to the proposed alternative uses for the subcombinations of Groups II and III, those alternative uses proposed by the Official Action are not viable. Given that these claims are directed to features which have been developed in view of use with the invention recited by the claims of Group I, applicant does not see any utility for the elements with features of Groups II and III apart from with use of the structure according to the Group I claims.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/051,179 Response dated October 30, 2003 Reply to Office Action of October 3, 2003 Docket No. 2505-1002

Examination on the merits of all the originally-filed claims is therefore solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

Roland E. Long, Jr., Reg. No. 41,949
745 South 23rd Street

Arlington, VA 22202

Telephone (703) 521-2297

Telefax (703) 685-0573

(703) 979-4709

REL/lrs